



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Man A. Leete

Title: POWER SUPPLY WITH BUS HUB

Docket No.: 884.335US1

Filed: December 5, 2000

Examiner: Christopher E Lee

Serial No.: 09/730,238

Due Date: January 22, 2006

Group Art Unit: 2112

**MS Appeal Brief - Patents**

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

We are transmitting herewith the following attached items (as indicated with an "X"):

- ☒ Return postcard.
- ☒ REQUEST FOR REHEARING (5 pgs.).
- ☒ A Copy of Appeal Brief as filed on March 8, 2005 (36 pgs.).
- ☒ A Copy of Decision on Appeal as mailed on November 22, 2005 (16 pgs.).

Please consider this a **PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** for sufficient number of months to enter these papers and please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.


Customer Number 21186


By: 

Atty: Robert E. Mates

Reg. No. 35,271

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 20th day of January, 2006.

  
Name

  
Signature

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
(GENERAL)



**COPY**

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Brian A. Leete

Title: POWER SUPPLY WITH BUS HUB

Docket No.: 884.335US1

Filed: December 5, 2000

Examiner: Christopher E Lee

Serial No.: 09/730,238

Due Date: March 8, 2005

Group Art Unit: 2112

**MS Appeal Brief**

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

We are transmitting herewith the following attached items (as indicated with an "X"):

- ☒ A return postcard.
- ☒ An Appeal Brief under 37 CFR 41.37 (35 Pages).
- ☒ Permission to charge Deposit Account No. 19-0743 in the amount of \$500.00 to cover the required fee to file an Appeal Brief.
- ☒ Petition for Extension of Time (1 pg.)
- ☒ Permission to charge Deposit Account No. 19-0743 in the amount of \$120.00 to cover the Extension of Time Fee.
- ☒ Examiner Interview Summary (1 pg.).

Please consider this a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME for sufficient number of months to enter these papers and please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

Customer Number 21186


By: 

Atty: Robert E. Mates


Reg. No. 35,271

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Appeal Brief, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 8th day of March, 2005.

Name



Signature



SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

(GENERAL)



**COPY**



**PATENT**

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:	)	
	)	
Brian A. Leete	)	Examiner: Christopher
E. Lee	)	
Serial No.: 09/730,238	)	Group Art Unit: 2112
Filed: December 05, 2000	)	Docket: 884.335US1
For: POWER SUPPLY WITH BUS HUB)	)	

---

**APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief- Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

The Appeal Brief is presented in support of the Notice of Appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, filed on December 8, 2004, from the Final Rejection of claims 1-23 and 26-48 of the above-identified application, as set forth in the Final Office Action mailed on September 8, 2004.

The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 19-0743 in the amount of 500.00 which represents the requisite fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 41.2(b)(2). The Appellants respectfully request consideration and reversal of the Examiner's rejections of pending claims.

# COPY

## APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R § 41.37

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.....	2
2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.....	3
3. STATUS OF CLAIMS .....	4
4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS .....	5
5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER .....	6
6. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL .....	8
7. ARGUMENT.....	10
CLAIMS APPENDIX .....	27

# COPY

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37  
Serial Number: 09/730238  
Filing Date: December 5, 2000  
Title: POWER SUPPLY WITH BUS HUB  
Assignee: Intel Corporation

---

Page 2  
Dkt: 884.335US1 (INTEL)

## 1. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest of the above-captioned patent application is the assignee, INTEL CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation doing business at 2625 Walsh Avenue, Santa Clara, CA 95051, in an assignment recorded on December 5, 2000 (Reel/Frame 011362/0819-0821).

**COPY**

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37  
Serial Number: 09/730238  
Filing Date: December 5, 2000  
Title: POWER SUPPLY WITH BUS HUB  
Assignee: Intel Corporation

---

Page 3  
Dkt: 884.335US1 (INTEL)

## **2. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

There are no other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings known to the appellant which will have a bearing on the Board's decision in the present appeal.

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37  
Serial Number: 09/730238  
Filing Date: December 5, 2000  
Title: POWER SUPPLY WITH BUS HUB  
Assignee: Intel Corporation

---

**COPY**

Page 4  
Dkt: 884.335US1 (INTEL)

### **3. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-23 and 26-48 are pending in the application and are rejected. Claims 1-23 and 26-48 are being appealed.

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37  
Serial Number: 09/730238  
Filing Date: December 5, 2000  
Title: POWER SUPPLY WITH BUS HUB  
Assignee: Intel Corporation

---

**COPY**

Page 5  
Dkt: 884.335US1 (INTEL)

#### **4. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

No Amendment has been filed by the appellant subsequent to the final Office Action dated September 8, 2004.



## **5. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

The following is a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims involved in the appeal. Claim elements are identified at least once by reference character and by the page and line in the specification where the element may be found.

Claim 1 recites an apparatus including a housing (422, page 5, line 27), a power supply (410, page 6, line 1) enclosed in the housing, a bus hub (415, page 6, line 1) enclosed in the housing, the power supply being coupled to the bus hub to supply power to the bus hub, and a downstream receptacle (145, page 6, line 2) in the housing connected to both the power supply and the bus hub, the downstream receptacle being coupled to a cable (115, page 6, line 2) to couple power from the power supply and data signals from the bus hub to the cable and to receive power and data signals from the cable.

Claim 12 recites a computing unit (100, page 3, line 16) including a computer (110, page 3, line 17). The computer includes an upstream receptacle (130, page 3, line 21) to deliver data signals to the computer and a power receptacle (130, page 3, line 21) to deliver electrical power to the computer. The computing unit also includes a power hub (120, page 3, line 17) coupled to the upstream receptacle and the power receptacle via a cable. The power hub includes a housing, a power supply enclosed in the housing, the power supply being coupled to the cable to provide power to the computer, and a bus hub enclosed in the housing, the bus hub being coupled to the cable to receive power and data signals from the computer and the power supply being coupled to the bus hub to supply power to the bus hub.

Claim 21 recites a cable including a device power wire (210, page 4, line 3) to provide power from a computer to a power hub, a device ground wire (215, page 4, line 3), a computer power wire (220, page 4, line 3-4) to provide power from the power hub to the computer, a computer ground wire (225, page 4, line 4), and a plurality of signal wires (205 and 206, page 4, line 3) to carry data signals between the computer and the power hub.

# COPY

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37  
Serial Number: 09/730238  
Filing Date: December 5, 2000  
Title: POWER SUPPLY WITH BUS HUB  
Assignee: Intel Corporation

---

Page 7  
Dkt: 884.335US1 (INTEL)

Claim 29 recites an apparatus including a housing, a power supply enclosed in the housing, the power supply being coupled to receive alternating current (AC) power to convert the AC power into direct current (DC) power, a bus hub enclosed in the housing, the bus hub being coupled to the power supply to receive DC power from the power supply, and a downstream receptacle in the housing connected to both the power supply and the bus hub, the downstream receptacle being coupled to a cable to couple DC power from the power supply and data signals from the bus hub to the cable and to receive DC power and data signals from the cable.

Claim 39 recites a computing unit including a computer. The computer includes an upstream receptacle to deliver data signals to the computer and a power receptacle to deliver electrical power to the computer. The computing unit also includes a power hub coupled to the upstream receptacle and the power receptacle of the computer via a cable. The power hub includes a housing, a power supply enclosed in the housing, the power supply being coupled to receive alternating current (AC) power to convert the AC power into direct current (DC) power, the power supply being coupled to the cable to provide DC power to the computer, and a bus hub enclosed in the housing, the bus hub being coupled to the power supply to receive DC power from the power supply and to the cable to receive power and data signals from the computer.

## **6. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

I. Claims 1 to 4, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 28 to 32, 39, and 41 to 43 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig (U.S. 6,701,192 B1) and Flannery (U.S. 5,799,196 A).

II. Claims 5, 20, 33, and 44 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, and USB Specification 1998 (Universal Serial Bus Specification published by Compaq, Intel, Microsoft and NEC, Rev. 1.1, September 23, 1998).

III. Claims 6, 18, 34 to 36, and 45 to 47 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, and Urade et al. (U.S. 6,272,644 B1, Urade).

IV. Claims 8 and 38 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, Kang et al. (U.S. 6,253,329 B1, Kang) and Tsai (U.S. 6,283,789 B1).

V. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, Kang, Tsai, and Decuir (U.S. 5,781,028 A).

VI. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, Kang, Tsai, and Sanchez (U.S. 6,446,867).

VII. Claims 13 and 40 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, and Tsai.

VIII. Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, Tsai, and Decuir.

IX. Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, Tsai, and Sanchez.

X. Claims 21 to 23 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig and Tsai.

XI. Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Tsai, and Decuir.

XII. Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Tsai, and Sanchez.

# COPY

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37  
Serial Number: 09/730238  
Filing Date: December 5, 2000  
Title: POWER SUPPLY WITH BUS HUB  
Assignee: Intel Corporation

---

Page 9  
Dkt: 884.335US1 (INTEL)

XIII. Claims 37 and 48 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, Urade, and Silverman et al. (U.S. 6,370,603 B1, Silverman).

## 7. ARGUMENT

### *The Applicable Law*

All of the pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103:

"A patent may not be obtained...if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art."<sup>1</sup>

The MPEP states the following with regard to rejections under 35 USC § 103:

"To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations."<sup>2</sup>

The appellant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 1-23 and 26-48 under §103 are improperly based on hindsight as the final Office Action has not provided clear and particular evidence of a suggestion or motivation to form the proposed combinations from the applied references. The applied references teach away from the proposed combinations. The final Office Action is also missing evidence of a reasonable expectation of success for each combination of references.

A Federal Circuit opinion states that the suggestion or motivation to combine references and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art.<sup>3</sup>

Multiple Federal Circuit decisions emphasize the need for the PTO to furnish evidence in support of claim rejections. For example, the Federal Circuit addressed citation of "basic knowledge or common sense" in rejections in *In re Zurko*:

"With respect to core factual findings in a determination of patentability, however, the Board [Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences] cannot simply reach conclusions based on its own understanding or experience – or on its assessment of what would be basic knowledge or common sense. Rather, the Board must point to some concrete evidence in the record in support of these findings."<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

<sup>2</sup> MPEP 2143.

<sup>3</sup> MPEP 2143 citing *In re Vaack*, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1442 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

<sup>4</sup> *In re Zurko*, 59 USPQ2d 1693, 1697 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

COPY

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 41.37  
Serial Number: 09/730238  
Filing Date: December 5, 2000  
Title: POWER SUPPLY WITH BUS HUB  
Assignee: Intel Corporation

Page 11  
Dkt: 884.335US1 (INTEL)

The Federal Circuit has particularly emphasized the need for the PTO to furnish evidence in support of claim rejections under 35 USC § 103 in *In re Lee*:

“When patentability turns on the question of obviousness, the search for and analysis of the prior art includes evidence relevant to the finding of whether there is a teaching, motivation, or suggestion to select and combine the references relied on as evidence of obviousness.....The factual inquiry whether to combine references must be thorough and searching....It must be based on objective evidence of record.”<sup>5</sup>

The Federal Circuit stated that the “need for specificity pervades this authority” requiring a teaching, motivation, or suggestion to select and combine references.<sup>6</sup> The Federal Circuit has expressed this need for specificity in several cases:

“[T]he best defense against the subtle but powerful attraction of a hindsight-based obviousness analysis is rigorous application of the requirement for a showing of the teaching or motivation to combine prior art references.....the showing must be clear and particular.”<sup>7</sup>

“[E]ven when the level of skill in the art is high, the Board must identify specifically the principle, known to one of ordinary skill, that suggests the claimed combination.”<sup>8</sup>

“[P]articular findings must be made as to the reason the skilled artisan, with no knowledge of the claimed invention, would have selected these components for combination in the manner claimed.”<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> *In re Lee*, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1433 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

<sup>6</sup> *In re Lee*, 61 USPQ2d 1430, 1433 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

<sup>7</sup> *In re Dembiczak*, 50 USPQ2d 1614, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

<sup>8</sup> *In re Rouffet*, 47 USPQ2d 1453, 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

<sup>9</sup> *In re Kotzab*, 55 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2000).

### *Rejections*

- I. Claims 1 to 4, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 28 to 32, 39, and 41 to 43 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig (U.S. 6,701,192 B1) and Flannery (U.S. 5,799,196 A).

Representative of the rejected claims, claim 1 recites an apparatus, comprising, among other elements, a housing, a power supply enclosed in the housing, a bus hub enclosed in the housing, the power supply being coupled to the bus hub to supply power to the bus hub, and a downstream receptacle in the housing connected to both the power supply and the bus hub.

The final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to modify Herwig according to Flannery as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*, and has not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig and Flannery as is required by *In re Vaeck* and *In re Lee*.

Herwig relates to a wiring hub for a retail terminal.<sup>10</sup> Herwig shows a wiring hub 100 including a housing 110, a USB hub interface 114, and a power supply 112. Herwig does not show a connection from power supply 112 to the USB hub interface 114. The final Office Action states that "Herwig does not expressly teach said power supply [112] being coupled to said bus hub [114] to supply power to said bus hub."<sup>11</sup> This can be seen in Fig. 3 of Herwig.

Flannery relates to a self-powered USB device.<sup>12</sup> Flannery shows in Figure 1A a USB host 100 that has its own power supply 118 and a remote hub 104A that has its own power supply 108.

The USB hub interface 114 of Herwig and the remote hub 104A of Flannery are each consistent with the following description of a USB device from the USB Specification 1998:

---

<sup>10</sup> Herwig, abstract.

<sup>11</sup> Final Office Action, page 3.

"Each USB segment provides a limited amount of power over the cable. The host supplies power for use by USB devices that are directly connected. In addition, any USB device may have its own power supply. USB devices that rely totally on power from the cable are called bus-powered devices. In contrast, those that have an alternate source of power are called self-powered devices. A hub also supplies power for its connected USB devices."<sup>13</sup>

According to the USB Specification 1998, a USB device either receives power from a host through the USB cable, or has its own power supply. The remote hub 104A of Flannery has its own power supply 108. In fact, Flannery has a consistent description of the USB system.<sup>14</sup> The USB hub interface 114 of Herwig does not show an internal power supply, but one skilled in the art would understand that the USB hub interface 114 would get its power from a host or from its own internal power supply as described in the USB Specification 1998. Herwig has a priority date of 13 September 2000, well after the publication of the USB Specification 1998, and one skilled in the art would conclude that the USB hub interface 114 of Herwig conforms to the USB Specification 1998.

The final Office Action states that:

"it would have been obvious....to have included said apparatus of providing power management, as disclosed by Flannery, to said apparatus, as disclosed by Herwig, so as to provide a superior solution to supplying the power needs of suspend/resume capabilities in a computer without the inefficiencies of a dual-stage power supply unit or the expense of incorporating both low-power and full-power units (See Flannery, col. 2, line 62 through col. 3, line 2) with the advantage of being able to supply 500mA to each downstream device (e.g., printers and speakers) attached to said bus hub (See Flannery, col. 4, lines 50-64)."<sup>15</sup>

The final Office Action proposes as the motivation for the combination the above text from the Summary of Flannery. However, Flannery only shows electronics internal to a USB host and a USB remote hub. Flannery's claimed advantages arise from these electronics internal to the USB system shown and described by Flannery. One skilled in the art would not be motivated by Flannery to couple the power supply 112 to the USB hub interface 114 of Herwig because the power supply 112 is outside the USB system shown in Herwig. The final Office Action has not shown how such a coupling in Herwig

---

<sup>12</sup> Flannery, Title.

<sup>13</sup> USB Specification 1998, Section 4.3.1, page 18.

<sup>14</sup> Flannery, col. 3, line 52 to col. 4, line 64.



would bring the benefits claimed by Flannery. According to the USB Specification 1998, the USB hub interface 114 of Herwig would get its power from a host or from its own internal power supply, not the power supply 112.

The final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of this motivation to modify Herwig according to Flannery as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*. The final Office Action is improperly using hindsight in combining Herwig and Flannery contrary to *In re Dembiczak*.

The final Office Action has also not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig and Flannery as is required by *In re Vaack* and *In re Lee*.

The appellant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 1 to 4, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 28 to 32, 39, and 41 to 43 has not been established in the final Office Action. Reversal of the rejection of claims 1 to 4, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 28 to 32, 39, and 41 to 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

II. Claims 5, 20, 33, and 44 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, and USB Specification 1998.

The final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to modify Herwig according to Flannery and USB Specification 1998 as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*.

Representative of the rejected claims, claim 5 is dependent on claim 1 and recites that the bus hub is bus powered.

The final Office Action states that:

“Herwig....does not expressly teach said bus hub is bus powered. The Examiner takes Official Notice that said bus hub is bus powered...as evidenced by USB Spec....it would have been obvious....to have included said bus powered bus hub in said apparatus since it would allow power being always available to said bus hub.”<sup>16</sup>

The motivation for modifying Herwig from USB Specification 1998 quoted above

---

<sup>15</sup> Final Office Action, pages 3-4.

<sup>16</sup> Final Office Action, page 9.

is contrary to the motivation in the final Office Action for combining Herwig with Flannery discussed in section I above. If the USB hub interface 114 of Herwig is bus powered according to the Examiner's Official Notice here, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to couple the power supply 112 to the USB hub interface 114 of Herwig. A bus powered USB hub does not need an additional source of power. The USB Specification 1998 does not provide a motivation for the combination of Herwig and Flannery, and in fact teaches away from the combination in the final Office Action as discussed above in section I. The final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of this motivation to modify Herwig according to Flannery and USB Specification 1998 as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*. The final Office Action is improperly using hindsight in combining Herwig, Flannery, and USB Specification 1998 contrary to *In re Dembiczak*.

The final Office Action has also not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig, Flannery, and USB Specification 1998 as is required by *In re Vaack* and *In re Lee*. The final Office Action has not shown evidence of how the USB hub interface 114 of Herwig can be bus powered and be coupled to receive power from the power supply 112.

The appellant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 5, 20, 33, and 44 has not been established in the final Office Action. Reversal of the rejection of claims 5, 20, 33, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

III. Claims 6, 18, 34 to 36, and 45 to 47 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, and Urade et al. (U.S. 6,272,644 B1, Urade).

The final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to modify Herwig according to Flannery and Urade as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*.

Representative of the rejected claims, claim 6 recites a hub repeater connected to the upstream port.

Urade relates to a method of controlling a USB hub by a microcontroller.<sup>17</sup> Urade shows a USB Hub 11 in Figure 3 with a Hub Repeater 12. The final Office Action states that:

“it would have been obvious....to have included said hub repeater, as disclosed by Urade, in said bus hub, as disclosed by Herwig, as modified by Flannery, so as to manage port connectivity between a selected downstream functional device and a host computer connected to said upstream port.”<sup>18</sup>

Urade discusses the USB standard in the background, and the method described appears to be consistent with the USB standard. However, Urade does not provide a motivation for modifying Herwig in view of Flannery. The final Office Action has not identified clear and particular evidence of a motivation in Urade for the original modification of Herwig discussed above in section I as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*, and therefore there is no clear and particular evidence of a motivation to combine Herwig, Flannery, and Urade. The final Office Action is improperly using hindsight in combining Herwig, Flannery, and Urade contrary to *In re Dembiczak*.

The final Office Action has also not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig, Flannery, and Urade as is required by *In re Vaeck* and *In re Lee*. The final Office Action has not shown evidence of how the USB hub interface 114 of Herwig can have the Hub Repeater 12 of Urade and be coupled to receive power from the power supply 112.

The appellant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 6, 18, 34 to 36, and 45 to 47 has not been established in the final Office Action. Reversal of the rejection of claims 6, 18, 34 to 36, and 45 to 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

IV. Claims 8 and 38 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, Kang et al. (U.S. 6,253,329 B1, Kang) and Tsai (U.S. 6,283,789 B1).

The final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in

---

<sup>17</sup> Urade, Abstract.

<sup>18</sup> Final Office Action, pages 9-10.

support of a motivation to modify Herwig according to Flannery, Kang, and Tsai as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*.

Representative of the rejected claims, claim 8 recites that the cable further comprises a device power wire, a device ground wire, a computer power wire, a computer ground wire, and a plurality of signal wires.

Kang relates to a USB hub with a plurality of input power sources.<sup>19</sup> The final Office Action states that:

“it would have been obvious....to have applied said plurality of input power sources, as disclosed by Kang, to said apparatus, as disclosed by Herwig, as modified by Flannery, so as said power supply to supply power to said bus hub for the advantage of providing said bus hub (i.e., USB hub) having a plurality of input power supplies (See Kang, col. 2, lines 3-10).”<sup>20</sup>

The applicant respectfully submits that, on the contrary, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine Herwig with Kang. Kang states that:

“A circuit is constructed so that the user can select bus power or self-power as to the power source of the USB hub depending on the user’s necessity. As a result, it is not necessary for the user to purchase a bus power USB hub or a self-power USB hub separately. The user who employs the present invention can easily select a power source supply method which fits his use by simply adding a power source cable for self-power.”<sup>21</sup>

Kang and Herwig are clearly showing two different, unrelated devices. The USB hub of Kang can run from two different power sources to give the user more options. Kang does not show a power supply inside its USB hub, and all power is supplied from sources outside the device of Kang. The system of Herwig is a wiring hub for a retail terminal. The self-described advantage of Kang is not applicable to Herwig. One skilled in the art would not have been motivated to modify Herwig based on the showing of Kang. In fact, combining them would go against the teachings of one of them, because the desirable flexibility allowing use of Kang with separate power supplies “teaches away” from the apparatus in Herwig with its power supply and hub in the same enclosure.

---

<sup>19</sup> Kang, Title.

<sup>20</sup> Final Office Action, page 11.

<sup>21</sup> Kang, column 5, lines 28-35.

Kang also does not provide a motivation for modifying Herwig in view of Flannery that is lacking in the final Office Action as discussed in section I.

Tsai relates to a data and power transmitting cable system.<sup>22</sup> The final Office Action states that:

“it would have been obvious....to have implemented said cable, as disclosed by Herwig, as modified by Flannery and Kang, using said cable system, as disclosed by Tsai, for the advantage of providing a compact and clean wiring in said housing, which is common sense to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronics wiring.”<sup>23</sup>

The final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of this motivation to combine Herwig, Flannery, Kang, and Tsai as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*. The final Office Action cannot rely on common sense alone to support a rejection, as this is contrary to *In re Zurko*. The final Office Action is improperly using hindsight in combining Herwig, Flannery, Kang, and Tsai contrary to *In re Dembiczak*.

The final Office Action has also not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig, Flannery, Kang, and Tsai as is required by *In re Vaeck* and *In re Lee*.

The appellant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 8 and 38 has not been established in the final Office Action. Reversal of the rejection of claims 8 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

V. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, Kang, Tsai, and Decuir (U.S. 5,781,028 A).

Claim 9 depends from claim 8 discussed above, and recites that the plurality of signal wires further comprises a signal twisted pair.

Decuir relates to data bus termination,<sup>24</sup> and shows a twisted pair data cable 72 that permits bidirectional data communication between a USB interface in a computer and a USB peripheral device. The final Office Action states that:

---

<sup>22</sup> Tsai, title.

<sup>23</sup> Final Office Action, page 12.

<sup>24</sup> Decuir, Title.

“it would have been obvious....to have used said twisted pair cable, as disclosed by Decuir, for said signal wires, as disclosed by Herwig, as modified by Flannery, Kang and Tsai, for the advantage of supporting high speed version of USB (See Decuir, col. 5, lines 5-7).”<sup>25</sup>

As discussed above in section IV, the final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine Herwig, Flannery, Kang, and Tsai, and Decuir does not supply a motivation for such a combination. Therefore, the final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine Herwig, Flannery, Kang, Tsai, and Decuir as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*. The final Office Action has also not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig, Flannery, Kang, Tsai, and Decuir as is required by *In re Vaeck* and *In re Lee*.

The appellant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 9 has not been established in the final Office Action. Reversal of the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

VI. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, Kang, Tsai, and Sanchez (U.S. 6,446,867).

Claim 10 depends from claim 8 discussed above, and recites that the plurality of signal wires further comprises a fiber optic channel.

Sanchez relates to an electro-optic interface system<sup>26</sup> including a fiber optic cable 135. The final Office Action states that:

“it would have been obvious....to have used said fiber optic channel with its driver, as disclosed by Sanchez, for signal wires, as disclosed by Herwig, as modified by Flannery, Kang and Tsai, for the advantage of providing an electro-optic system of operation for communicating high speed digital signals between two or more electronic systems (See Sanchez, col. 1, lines 57-60) without spreading electromagnetic noise.”<sup>27</sup>

As discussed above in section IV, the final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine Herwig, Flannery,

---

<sup>25</sup> Final Office Action, page 12.

<sup>26</sup> Sanchez, Title.

<sup>27</sup> Final Office Action, page 13.

Kang, and Tsai, and Sanchez does not supply a motivation for such a combination. Therefore, the final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine Herwig, Flannery, Kang, Tsai, and Sanchez as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*. The final Office Action has also not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig, Flannery, Kang, Tsai, and Sanchez as is required by *In re Vaeck* and *In re Lee*.

The appellant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 10 has not been established in the final Office Action. Reversal of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

VII. Claims 13 and 40 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, and Tsai.

Representative of the rejected claims, claim 13 recites the computing unit of claim 12, wherein the cable further comprises a device power wire, a device ground wire, a computer power wire, a computer ground wire, and a plurality of signal wires.

Herwig, Flannery, and Tsai are all discussed above. The final Office Action states that:

“it would have been obvious....to have implemented said cable, as disclosed by Herwig, as modified by Flannery, using said cable system, as disclosed by Tsai, for the advantage of providing a compact and clean wiring in said housing, which is a common sense to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronics wiring.”<sup>28</sup>

The final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of this motivation to combine Herwig, Flannery, and Tsai as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*. The final Office Action cannot rely on common sense alone to support a rejection, as this is contrary to *In re Zurko*. The final Office Action is improperly using hindsight in combining Herwig, Flannery, and Tsai contrary to *In re Dembiczak*.

The final Office Action has also not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig, Flannery, and Tsai as is required by *In re Vaeck* and *In re Lee*.

The appellant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 13 and 40 has not been established in the final Office Action. Reversal of the rejection of claims 13 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

VIII. Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, Tsai, and Decuir.

Claim 14 is dependent on claim 13, and recites "the plurality of signal wires comprises a twisted pair."

Herwig, Flannery, Tsai, and Decuir are discussed above. The final Office Action states that:

"it would have been obvious....to have used said twisted pair cable, as disclosed by Decuir, for said signal wires, as disclosed by Herwig, as modified by Flannery and Tsai, for the advantage of supporting high speed version of USB (See Decuir, col. 5, lines 5-7)."<sup>29</sup>

As discussed above in section VII, the final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine Herwig, Flannery, and Tsai, and Decuir does not supply a motivation for such a combination. Therefore, the final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine Herwig, Flannery, Tsai, and Decuir as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*. The final Office Action has also not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig, Flannery, Tsai, and Decuir as is required by *In re Vaeck* and *In re Lee*.

The appellant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 14 has not been established in the final Office Action. Reversal of the rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

IX. Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, Tsai, and Sanchez.

Claim 15 is dependent on claim 13, and recites "the plurality of signal wires

---

<sup>28</sup> Final Office Action, page 14.

<sup>29</sup> Final Office Action, pages 14-15.



COPY

comprises a fiber optic channel.”

Herwig, Flannery, Tsai, and Sanchez were discussed above. The final Office Action states that:

“it would have been obvious....to have used said fiber optic channel with its driver, as disclosed by Sanchez, for signal wires, as disclosed by Herwig, as modified by Flannery and Tsai, for the advantage of providing an electro-optic system of operation for communicating high aped digital signals between two or more electronic systems (See Sanchez, col. 1, lines 57-60) without spreading electromagnetic noise.”<sup>30</sup>

As discussed above in section VII, the final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine Herwig, Flannery, and Tsai, and Sanchez does not supply a motivation for such a combination. Therefore, the final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine Herwig, Flannery, Tsai, and Sanchez as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*. The final Office Action has also not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig, Flannery, Tsai, and Sanchez as is required by *In re Vaeck* and *In re Lee*.

The appellant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 15 has not been established in the final Office Action. Reversal of the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

X. Claims 21 to 23 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig and Tsai.

Independent claim 21 recites a cable comprising a device power wire, a device ground wire, a computer power wire, a computer ground wire, and a plurality of signal wires. Claims 22 and 23 depend from claim 21.

Herwig and Tsai are discussed above. The final Office Action states that:

“it would have been obvious....to have implemented said cable, as disclosed by Herwig, in said cable system, as disclosed by Tsai, for the advantage of providing a compact and clean wiring in said housing, which is a common sense to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronics wiring.”<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Final Office Action, page 13.

<sup>31</sup> Final Office Action, page 16.

COPY

The final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of this motivation to combine Herwig and Tsai as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*. The final Office Action cannot rely on common sense alone to support a rejection, as this is contrary to *In re Zurko*. The final Office Action is improperly using hindsight in combining Herwig and Tsai contrary to *In re Dembiczak*.

The final Office Action has also not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig and Tsai as is required by *In re Vaeck* and *In re Lee*.

The appellant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 21 to 23 has not been established in the final Office Action. Reversal of the rejection of claims 21 to 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

XI. Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Tsai, and Decuir.

Claim 26 is dependent on claim 21, and recites "the plurality of signal wires comprises a twisted pair."

Herwig, Tsai, and Decuir are discussed above. The final Office Action states that:

"it would have been obvious....to have used said twisted pair cable, as disclosed by Decuir, for said signal wires, as disclosed by Herwig, as modified by Tsai, for the advantage of supporting high speed version of USB (See Decuir, col. 5, lines 5-7)."<sup>32</sup>

As discussed above in section X, the final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine Herwig and Tsai, and Decuir does not supply a motivation for such a combination. Therefore, the final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine Herwig, Tsai, and Decuir as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*. The final Office Action has also not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig, Tsai, and Decuir as is required by *In re Vaeck* and *In re Lee*.

---

<sup>32</sup> Final Office Action, page 17.

The appellant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 26 has not been established in the final Office Action. Reversal of the rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

XII. Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Tsai, and Sanchez.

Claim 27 is dependent on claim 21, and recites "the plurality of signal wires comprises a fiber optic channel."

Herwig, Tsai, and Sanchez were discussed above. The final Office Action states that:

"it would have been obvious....to have used said fiber optic channel with its driver, as disclosed by Sanchez, for signal wires, as disclosed by Herwig, as modified by Tsai, for the advantage of providing an electro-optic system of operation for communicating high aped digital signals between two or more electronic systems (See Sanchez, col. 1, lines 57-60) without spreading electromagnetic noise."<sup>33</sup>

As discussed above in section X, the final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine Herwig and Tsai, and Sanchez does not supply a motivation for such a combination. Therefore, the final Office Action has not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine Herwig, Tsai, and Sanchez as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*. The final Office Action has also not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig, Tsai, and Sanchez as is required by *In re Vaeck* and *In re Lee*.

The appellant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 27 has not been established in the final Office Action. Reversal of the rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

XIII. Claims 37 and 48 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Herwig, Flannery, Urade, and Silverman et al. (U.S. 6,370,603 B1,

---

<sup>33</sup> Final Office Action, page 18.

Silverman).

Representative of the rejected claims, claim 37 recites that “the hub controller and the hub repeater comprise memory stored instructions executable by a processor or logic gates or a programmable logic device.”

Herwig, Flannery, and Urade were discussed above. Silverman relates to a configurable USB controller.<sup>34</sup> The final Office Action states that:

“it would have been obvious....to have included said configuration components...as disclosed by Silverman, in said hub controller and said hub repeater, as disclosed by Herwig, as modified by Flannery and Urade, for the advantage of providing an improved technique for effecting digital communications between said downstream devices....and systems using different communications protocols.”<sup>35</sup>

Silverman does not provide a motivation for modifying Herwig in view of Flannery and Urade. The final Office Action has not identified clear and particular evidence of a motivation in Silverman for the original modification of Herwig in view of Flannery and Urade discussed above in section III as is required by *In re Dembiczak* and *In re Lee*, and therefore there is no clear and particular evidence of a motivation to combine Herwig, Flannery, Urade, and Silverman. Also, the above-quoted rationale for combining Silverman with the other references is very general and not specific to the technical description in Silverman, and is therefore not the clear and particular evidence required by *In re Dembiczak*. The final Office Action is improperly using hindsight in combining Herwig, Flannery, Urade, and Silverman contrary to *In re Dembiczak*.

The final Office Action has also not cited evidence of a reasonable expectation of success of the proposed combination of Herwig, Flannery, Urade, and Silverman as is required by *In re Vaeck* and *In re Lee*.

The appellant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claims 37 and 48 has not been established in the final Office Action. Reversal of the rejection of claims 37 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

---

<sup>34</sup> Silverman, Title.

<sup>35</sup> Final Office Action, page 18-19.

COPY

*Request For Reversal*

For the foregoing reasons, the appellant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 1-23 and 26-48 under 35 U.S.C. §103 were erroneous. Reversal of those rejections is respectfully requested, as well as the allowance of all the rejected claims.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,


BRIAN A. LEETE

By his Representatives,


SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG,  
WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Date 8 March 2005 By   
Robert E. Mates  
Reg. No. 35,271

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 8<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2005.

Name Amy Moriarty Signature 

### **CLAIMS APPENDIX**

1. (Previously Presented) An apparatus, comprising:
  - a housing;
  - a power supply enclosed in the housing;
  - a bus hub enclosed in the housing, the power supply being coupled to the bus hub to supply power to the bus hub; and
  - a downstream receptacle in the housing connected to both the power supply and the bus hub, the downstream receptacle being coupled to a cable to couple power from the power supply and data signals from the bus hub to the cable and to receive power and data signals from the cable.
2. (Original) The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the bus hub further comprises an upstream port.
3. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the bus hub comprises:
  - at least one downstream port to connect to at least one downstream device.
4. (Original) The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the bus hub is self powered.
5. (Original) The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the bus hub is bus powered.
6. (Original) The apparatus of claim 2, further comprising:
  - a hub repeater connected to the upstream port.
7. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 1 wherein the power supply is coupled to receive alternating current (AC) power to convert the AC power into direct current (DC) power, the DC power being coupled to the downstream

**COPY**

receptacle and to the bus hub.

8. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 1 wherein the cable further comprises:
  - a device power wire to provide power to the bus hub;
  - a device ground wire;
  - a computer power wire to provide power from the power supply to a computer;
  - a computer ground wire; and
  - a plurality of signal wires to carry data signals between the computer and the bus hub.
9. (Original) The apparatus of claim 8, wherein the plurality of signal wires further comprises a signal twisted pair.
10. (Original) The apparatus of claim 8, wherein the plurality of signal wires further comprises a fiber optic channel.
11. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 1, wherein the power supply is coupled to a wire to receive alternating current (AC) power, the power supply to convert the AC power into direct current (DC) power.
12. (Previously Presented) A computing unit, comprising:
  - a computer comprising:
    - an upstream receptacle to deliver data signals to the computer; and
    - a power receptacle to deliver electrical power to the computer; and
  - a power hub coupled to the upstream receptacle and the power receptacle via a cable, wherein the power hub comprises:
    - a housing;
    - a power supply enclosed in the housing, the power supply being coupled to the cable to provide power to the computer; and

**COPY**

a bus hub enclosed in the housing, the bus hub being coupled to the cable to receive power and data signals from the computer and the power supply being coupled to the bus hub to supply power to the bus hub.

13. (Previously Presented) The computing unit of claim 12, wherein the cable further comprises:
  - a device power wire to provide power from the computer to the power hub;
  - a device ground wire;
  - a computer power wire to provide power from the power supply to the computer;
  - a computer ground wire; and
  - a plurality of signal wires to carry data signals between the computer and the power hub.
14. (Original) The computing unit of claim 13, wherein the plurality of signal wires comprises a twisted pair.
15. (Original) The computing unit of claim 13, wherein the plurality of signal wires comprises a fiber optic channel.
16. (Original) The computing unit of claim 12, wherein the bus hub further comprises an upstream port.
17. (Previously Presented) The computing unit of claim 12, wherein the bus hub further comprises:
  - at least one downstream port to connect to at least one downstream device.
18. (Previously Presented) The computing unit of claim 16, wherein the bus hub further comprises:
  - a hub repeater connected to the upstream port.



**COPY**

19. (Original) The computing unit of claim 12, wherein the bus hub is self powered.
20. (Original) The computing unit of claim 12, wherein the bus hub is bus powered.
21. (Previously Presented) A cable comprising:
  - a device power wire to provide power from a computer to a power hub;
  - a device ground wire;
  - a computer power wire to provide power from the power hub to the computer;
  - a computer ground wire; and
  - a plurality of signal wires to carry data signals between the computer and the power hub.
22. (Original) The cable of claim 21, wherein the cable further comprises:
  - an upstream plug to connect to both an upstream bus receptacle and a power receptacle, wherein the power receptacle draws electric power from the computer power wire.
23. (Previously Presented) The cable of claim 21, further comprising:
  - a downstream plug to electrically connect to both a downstream bus receptacle and a power receptacle, wherein the power receptacle is to supply electric power to the computer power wire, and wherein the downstream bus receptacle is connected to the device power wire, the device ground wire, and the plurality of signal wires.
- 24.-25. (Canceled)
26. (Previously Presented) The cable of claim 21 wherein the plurality of signal wires comprises a twisted pair.

COPY

27. (Previously Presented) The cable of claim 21 wherein the plurality of signal wires comprises a fiber optic channel.
28. (Previously Presented) The computing unit of claim 12 wherein the power supply is coupled to receive alternating current (AC) power to convert the AC power into direct current (DC) power, the DC power being coupled to the cable and to the bus hub.
29. (Previously Presented) An apparatus comprising:
  - a housing;
  - a power supply enclosed in the housing, the power supply being coupled to receive alternating current (AC) power to convert the AC power into direct current (DC) power;
  - a bus hub enclosed in the housing, the bus hub being coupled to the power supply to receive DC power from the power supply; and
  - a downstream receptacle in the housing connected to both the power supply and the bus hub, the downstream receptacle being coupled to a cable to couple DC power from the power supply and data signals from the bus hub to the cable and to receive DC power and data signals from the cable.
30. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the bus hub further comprises a root port.
31. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the bus hub further comprises a downstream port to be coupled to a downstream device.
32. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the bus hub is self powered.
33. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the bus hub is bus

powered.

34. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 29, further comprising a hub repeater coupled between a root port and a plurality of downstream ports in the bus hub to manage connections to and through the bus hub, each downstream port to be coupled to a downstream device.
35. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 34 wherein the downstream devices comprise one or more of a mouse, a speaker, a telephone, a keyboard, a joystick, a camera, a modem, a scanner, and a printer.
36. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 34, further comprising a hub controller coupled to the hub repeater in the bus hub to route signals between the root port and the downstream ports and to perform error detection and recovery.
37. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 36 wherein the hub controller and the hub repeater comprise memory stored instructions executable by a processor or logic gates or a programmable logic device.
38. (Previously Presented) The apparatus of claim 29 wherein the cable further comprises:
  - a device power wire to provide DC power to the bus hub;
  - a device ground wire;
  - a computer power wire to provide DC power from the power supply to a computer;
  - a computer ground wire; and
  - a plurality of signal wires to carry data signals between the computer and the bus hub.

COPY

39. (Previously Presented) A computing unit, comprising:
- a computer comprising:
    - an upstream receptacle to deliver data signals to the computer; and
    - a power receptacle to deliver electrical power to the computer; and
  - a power hub coupled to the upstream receptacle and the power receptacle of the computer via a cable, wherein the power hub comprises:
    - a housing;
    - a power supply enclosed in the housing, the power supply being coupled to receive alternating current (AC) power to convert the AC power into direct current (DC) power, the power supply being coupled to the cable to provide DC power to the computer; and
    - a bus hub enclosed in the housing, the bus hub being coupled to the power supply to receive DC power from the power supply and to the cable to receive power and data signals from the computer.
40. (Previously Presented) The computing unit of claim 39, wherein the cable further comprises:
- a device power wire to provide DC power from the computer to the power hub;
  - a device ground wire;
  - a computer power wire to provide DC power from the power supply to the computer;
  - a computer ground wire; and
  - a plurality of signal wires to carry data signals between the computer and the power hub.
41. (Previously Presented) The computing unit of claim 39 wherein the bus hub further comprises a root port.
42. (Previously Presented) The computing unit of claim 39 wherein the bus hub further comprises a downstream port to be coupled to a downstream device.

**COPY**

- 43. (Previously Presented) The computing unit of claim 39 wherein the bus hub is self powered.
- 44. (Previously Presented) The computing unit of claim 39 wherein the bus hub is bus powered.
- 45. (Previously Presented) The computing unit of claim 39, further comprising a hub repeater coupled between a root port and a plurality of downstream ports in the bus hub to manage connections to and through the bus hub, each downstream port to be coupled to a downstream device.
- 46. (Previously Presented) The computing unit of claim 45 wherein the downstream devices comprise one or more of a mouse, a speaker, a telephone, a keyboard, a joystick, a camera, a modem, a scanner, and a printer.
- 47. (Previously Presented) The computing unit of claim 45, further comprising a hub controller coupled to the hub repeater in the bus hub to route signals between the root port and the downstream ports and to perform error detection and recovery.
- 48. (Previously Presented) The computing unit of claim 47 wherein the hub controller and the hub repeater comprise memory stored instructions executable by a processor or logic gates or a programmable logic device.



**COPY**

884.335451 APDR

The opinion in support of the decision being entered today was not written for publication and is not binding precedent of the Board.


UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte BRIAN A. LEETE

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

ON BRIEF



Before KRASS, JERRY SMITH, and BARRETT, Administrative Patent Judges.

KRASS, Administrative Patent Judge.

*Reopen Pros.  
Reg. Rehearing  
1/22/06 DV*

DECISION ON APPEAL

This is a decision on appeal from the final rejection of claims 1 through 23 and 26 through 48. Claims 24 and 25 have been canceled.

**PORTFOLIO I.P.**

NOV 25 2005

**RECEIVED**

# COPY

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

The invention pertains to a power supply with a bus hub, illustrated by representative independent claim 1, reproduced as follows:

1. An apparatus, comprising:

a housing;

a power supply enclosed in the housing;

a bus hub enclosed in the housing, the power being coupled to the bus hub to supply power to the bus; and

a downstream receptacle in the housing connected to both the power supply and the bus hub, the downstream receptacle being coupled to a cable to couple power from the power supply and data signals from the bus hub to the cable and to receive power and data signals from the cable.

The examiner relies on the following references:

Decuir	5,781,028	Jul. 14, 1998
Flannery	5,799,196	Aug. 25, 1998
Kang	6,253,329	Jun. 26, 2001
		(filed Jan. 19, 1999)
Urade et al (Urade)	6,272,644 B1	Aug. 7, 2001
		(filed Jan. 6, 1999)
Tsai	6,283,789 B1	Sep. 4, 2001
		(filed Mar. 16, 2000)
Silverman et al (Silverman)	6,370,603 B1	Apr. 9, 2002
		(filed Oct. 5, 1998)
Sanchez	6,446,867 B1	Sep. 10, 2002
		(filed Dec. 24, 1999)
Herwig	6,701,192 B1	Mar. 2, 2004
		(filed Sept. 13, 2000)

# COPY

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

Claims 1-23 and 26-48 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103.  
As evidence of obvious, the examiner offers the following:

Claims 1-4, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 28-32, 39, and 41-43 stand rejected under Herwig and Flannery, with the USB specification added to this combination to reject claims 5, 20, 33, and 44. The examiner relies on Herwig, Flannery and Urade for the rejection of claims 6, 18, 34-36, and 45-47. Herwig, Flannery, Kang, and Tsai are relied on for the rejection of claims 8 and 38, with the addition of Decuir to this combination for the rejection of claim 9, but with the addition of Sanchez to the Herwig/Flannery/Kang/Tsai combination for the rejection of claim 10. Herwig, Flannery and Tsai are relied on for the rejection of claims 13 and 40. The examiner then adds Decuir to this combination for the rejection of claim 14, but adds Sanchez to this combination with regard to claim 15. Herwig and Tsai are relied on for the rejection of claims 21-23. The rejection of claim 26 is based on Herwig, Tsai, and Decuir, while the rejection of claim 27 is based on Herwig, Tsai and Sanchez. The examiner relies on Herwig, Flannery, Urade and Silverman for the rejection of claims 37 and 48.

Reference is made to the briefs and answer for the respective positions of appellants and the examiner.



# COPY

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

## OPINION

In rejecting claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, it is incumbent upon the examiner to establish a factual basis to support the legal conclusion of obviousness. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 1073, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In so doing, the examiner is expected to make the factual determinations set forth in Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 17, 148 USPQ 459, 467 (1966), and to provide a reason why one having ordinary skill in the pertinent art would have been led to modify the prior art or to combine prior art references to arrive at the claimed invention. Such reason must stem from some teachings, suggestions or implications in the prior art as a whole or knowledge generally available to one having ordinary skill in the art. Uniroyal, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp., 837 F.2d 1044, 1051, 5 USPQ2d 1434, 1438 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied, 488 U.S. 825 (1988); Ashland Oil, Inc. v. Delta Resins & Refractories, Inc., 776 F.2d 281, 293, 227 USPQ 657, 664 (Fed. Cir. 1985), cert. denied, 475 U.S. 1017 (1986); ACS Hosp. Sys., Inc. v. Montefiore Hosp., 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984). These showings by the examiner are an essential part of complying with the burden of presenting a prima facie case of obviousness. Note In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1445, 24 USPQ2d

# COPY

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

1443, 1444 (Fed. Cir. 1992). If that burden is met, the burden then shifts to the applicant to overcome the prima facie case with argument and/or evidence. Obviousness is then determined on the basis of the evidence as a whole and the relative persuasiveness of the arguments. See Id.; In re Hedges, 783 F.2d 1038, 1040, 228 USPQ 685, 687 (Fed. Cir. 1986); In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d 1468, 1472, 223 USPQ 785, 788 (Fed. Cir. 1984); and In re Rinehart, 531 F.2d 1048, 1051, 189 USPQ 143, 146-147 (CCPA 1976). Only those arguments actually made by appellant have been considered in this decision. Arguments which appellant could have made but chose not to make in the brief have not been considered and are deemed to be waived [see 37 CFR § 41.67(c)(1)(vii)].

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-4, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 28-32, 39, and 41-43, taking independent claim 1 as exemplary, the examiner refers to Figure 3 of Herwig. The examiner points out elements in Figure 3 of Herwig which correspond to the instant claimed elements: element 110 is the claimed housing; element 112 is the claimed power supply; element 114 is the claimed bus hub; the element at the top of the figure into which cable 94 and lines 106, 136, and 138 are directed is the claimed downstream receptacle.

# COPY

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

The examiner recognized that what Herwig's Figure 3 is lacking is a teaching of the power supply being coupled to the bus hub to supply power to the bus hub. The examiner then turned to Flannery for a teaching of an apparatus for providing power management using a self-powered USB device (Abstract; Figure 1A), wherein the apparatus comprises a power logic 114 and a power supply 108 being coupled to a bus hub logic 106 to supply power to the bus hub (referring to column 5, line 65 through column 6, line 11) (see pages 3-4 of the answer).

The examiner concluded that it would have been obvious to have included the power management apparatus of Flannery in Herwig "so as to provide a superior solution to supplying the power needs of suspend/resume capabilities in a computer without the inefficiencies of a dual-stage power supply unit or the expense of incorporating both low-power and full-power units (See Flannery, col. 2, line 62 through col. 3, line 2) with the advantage of being able to supply 500mA to each downstream device (e.g., printers and speakers) attached to said bus hub (See Flannery, col. 4, lines 50-64)" (answer-page 4).

# COPY

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

Appellants' response is to argue that the rejection is "improperly based on hindsight" and "has not provided clear and particular evidence of a suggestion or motivation to form the proposed combinations from the applied references" (principal brief-page 10).

In particular, appellants argue that Herwig relates to a wiring hub for a retail terminal and Flannery relates to a self-powered USB device (principal brief-page 12). They further argue that Flannery only shows electronics internal to a USB host and a USB remote hub, concluding that the skilled artisan "would not be motivated by Flannery to couple the power supply 112 to the USB hub interface 114 of Herwig because the power supply 112 is outside the USB system shown in Herwig" (principal brief-page 13).

We agree with the examiner that it would have been obvious, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103, to provide for the claimed connection of the power supply to the bus hub in Herwig.

Appellants state, at page 13, and reiterate on page 14, of the principal brief that in accordance with the USB Specification 1998, "a USB device either receives power from a host through the USB

# COPY

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

cable, or has its own power supply." We agree with this observation and, applying it to the USB hub in Figure 3 of Herwig, we note that the USB hub must get its power supply from either the cable 94 or from some other power supply. Based on the teaching of Flannery, a USB hub may have its own internal power supply. One skilled in the art viewing Flannery's teaching of an internal power supply for the USB hub, together with Herwig's teaching in Figure 3 of a USB hub and a separate power supply within the same housing, would have quickly come to realize that the power supplied to the USB hub, rather than being internal to the hub, may also come from a power supply already in the same housing as the USB hub, and convenient thereto.

Knowing that the USB hub must be powered from some source, and having teachings indicating that a power source may be in the USB cable, internal to the USB hub, or within the same housing as the USB hub, the skilled artisan would have been led to simply connect the already existing power supply 112, in Herwig, to the USB hub 114 as an alternative to the internal power source suggested by Flannery. Since the power supply 112 is already in the same housing, the artisan would have recognized that if one needs to supply power to the USB hub and that that power supply may be

# COPY

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

internal to the USB hub for self-powered USB devices (as taught by Flannery), such an "internal" power supply might as well be the power supply 112 internal to the housing and convenient to the USB hub in Herwig. Thus, the artisan would have been led from the teachings of the references to connect power supply 112, in Herwig, to the USB hub 114, in Herwig, to provide a self-powered alternative to a USB cable provided power supply.

Accordingly, we will sustain the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Moreover, since appellants do not argue claims 2-4, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 28-32, 39, and 41-43 separately from claim 1, these claims will fall with claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Turning to claims 5, 20, 33, and 44, with claim 5 the representative claim in this group, the examiner adds USB Specification to the previously applied references for a teaching of the bus hub being bus powered.

Clearly, the bus hub 114 in Herwig is "bus-powered" because Herwig does not show any other power source for the bus hub 114 and, as appellants admit, USB Specification 1998 requires that a USB device either receives power from a host through the USB cable, or has its own power supply. Since Herwig's USB hub indicates no

# COPY

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

internal power supply, the power must be provided by the USB cable. Hence, the bus hub in Herwig is bus powered, as claimed.

Appellants argue that the examiner has shown no evidence of the USB hub 114 in Herwig being bus powered and coupled to receive power from the power supply 112. We disagree. Clearly the USB hub 114 in Herwig is bus powered, as no other power source is depicted. Moreover, it would have been obvious to connect power supply 112 in Herwig to the USB hub 114 for the reasons explained supra. Accordingly, we agree with the examiner that it would have been obvious, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103, to power USB hub 114, alternatively, from both the USB cable and power supply 112.

Thus, we will sustain the rejection of claims 5, 20, 33, and 44 under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Turning, now to claims 6, 18, 34-36, and 45-47, the examiner added Urade to the Herwig/Flannery combination for a showing of the hub repeater connected to the upstream port.

Appellants do not dispute the examiner's reliance on Urade to show what the examiner alleges it shows, nor do appellants argue

**COPY**

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

the propriety of the combination of Urade with the other two references. Rather, appellants argue only that Urade "does not provide a motivation for modifying Herwig in view of Flannery" (principal brief-page 16).

Since we have explained, supra, that we view the combination of Herwig and Flannery to be proper, and appellants' argument anent claims 6, 18, 34-36, and 45-47 relies only on an allegation of an improper combination of Herwig and Flannery, as argued with regard to claim 1, we will sustain the rejection of claims 6, 18, 34-36, and 45-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

With regard to claims 8 and 38, the examiner adds Kang and Tsai to the Herwig/Flannery combination, finding that it would have been obvious to combine Kang's teaching of a USB hub having a plurality of input power sources, including a device power wire, a device ground wire, and a plurality of signal wires to carry data signals, and Tsai's teaching of a cable comprising a device power wire, a device ground wire, a computer power wire, a computer ground wire, and a plurality of signal wires, with the Herwig/Flannery combination device.



# COPY

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

Appellants argue that Kang is not combinable with Herwig because they relate to "two different, unrelated devices" (principal brief-page 17) and that Kang's self-described advantages are not applicable to Herwig. In fact, argue appellants, these two references teach away from each other "because the desirable flexibility allowing use of Kang with separate power supplies 'teaches away' from the apparatus in Herwig with its power supply and hub in the same enclosure" (principal brief-page 17).

Appellants' non-combinability argument based on unrelated devices in Herwig and Kang is not persuasive. Herwig teaches a USB cable but does not offer the specifics of the various wires within the cable. The examiner cited Kang and Tsai for teachings of USB cables having therein well known power wires, ground wires, computer power wires and a plurality of signal wires to carry data signals, in order to show what would normally be in such a USB cable as depicted generally in Herwig. The fact that certain devices in Herwig and Kang may or may not be related in some way does not detract from the teaching of certain wires found within USB cables and does not detract from the motivation for modifying Herwig to include such wires.

**COPY**

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

We note that appellants do not dispute the notoriety of placing in a USB cable the power wires, ground wires and signal wires set forth in the instant claims.

Thus, contrary to appellants' assertion, we find that the examiner has, indeed, provided "clear and particular evidence of record in support of this motivation to combine Herwig, Flannery, Kang, and Tsai."

Accordingly, we will sustain the rejection of claims 8 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

With regard to claim 9, wherein the examiner added Decuir to the Herwig/Flannery/Kang/Tsai combination to show the notoriety of providing a plurality of signal wires as a "signal twisted pair," and to claim 10, wherein the examiner added Sanchez to the Herwig/Flannery/Kang/Tsai combination to show that a plurality of signal wires may comprise a fiber optic channel, appellants merely argue generally that the examiner has "not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine." We disagree.

**COPY**

In our view, the examiner has presented a reasonable, prima facie case of obviousness with regard to the subject matter of instant claims 9 and 10, and appellants have shown no error in the examiner's rationale for combining the references.

Accordingly, we will sustain the rejection of claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Similarly, with regard to the rejections of claims 13 and 40, 14, 15, 21-23, 26, 27, 37, and 38, appellants sole response is to merely allege, generally, that the examiner has "not cited clear and particular evidence of record in support of a motivation to combine." Such general allegations fail to point out any perceived errors in the examiner's rationale.

Since, in our view, the examiner has set forth reasoning which establishes a prima facie case of obviousness, within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 103, and appellants have not convincingly rebutted it, we will sustain the rejections of claims 13 and 40, 14, 15, 21-23, 26, 27, 37, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103.


**COPY**


Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

The examiner's decision rejecting claims 1-23 and 26-48 under  
35 U.S.C. § 103 is affirmed.

No time period for taking any subsequent action in connection  
with this appeal may be extended under 37 CFR § 1.136(a)(1)-(iv).

AFFIRMED

  
ERROL A. KRASS )  
Administrative Patent Judge )

  
JERRY SMITH )  
Administrative Patent Judge )  
BOARD OF PATENT )  
APPEALS )  
AND )  
INTERFERENCES )

  
LEE E. BARRETT )  
Administrative Patent Judge )

EAK/dal

COPY

Appeal No. 2005-2753  
Application No. 09/730,238

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER  
and KLUTH,  
1600 TCF Tower  
121 South Eight Street  
Minneapolis, MN 55402